



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/934,699	08/22/2001	Satoru Okamoto	SEL 273	9139
7590		06/25/2007	EXAMINER	
COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD. Suite 2850 200 West Adams St. Chicago, IL 60606			DUONG, THOI V	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2871		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/25/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

8

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/934,699	OKAMOTO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Thoi V. Duong	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 52-85 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 52-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/25/07.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Amendment filed April 25, 2007.

Accordingly, claims 1-51 were amended, and new claims 52-85 were added.

Currently, claims 52-85 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 51-57, 59-66, 68-74 and 76-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami et al. (Minami, US 6,967,632) in view of Priestman et al. (Priestman, USPN 6,812,954 B1), Nakamura et al. (Nakamura, US 5,734,914) and Nakai et al. (Nakai, US 6,072,454).

Re claim 52, as shown in Figs. 1-7, Minami discloses an electronic device comprising:

a cover member comprising a first display panel 4 for displaying an image; and a second display panel 2 (col. 3, lines 49-59 and col. 12, lines 26-34), wherein the cover member comprising the first display panel 4 and the second display panel 2 are attached to each other to allow opening and closing (col. 4, lines 47-55 and col. 12, lines 21-25),

wherein the second display panel 2 includes a thin film transistor since the second display panel is an active matrix display (col. 3, lines 49-59), and

wherein the first display panel 4 and the second display panel 2 is a liquid crystal display panel (col. 12, lines 26-34).

However, Minami does not suggest that the second display panel comprising a touch input tablet.

As shown in Fig. 4, Priestman discloses a mobile videophone 200 (portable electronic device) comprising a first display panel 226 and a second display panel 220 comprising a touch input tablet which is used to control the basic operation of the videophone as well as being able to display video images received (col. 5, lines 17-22 and col. 8, lines 1-9 and 65-66).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electronic device of Minami by employing a touch input tablet for the second display panel as taught by Priestman in order to allow the user to input commands and raw data (col. 5, lines 17-22).

Further, Minami does not suggest a CPU electrically connected with the second display device and a flash memory electrically connected to the CPU.

As shown in Fig. 1, Nakamura discloses a display comprising an LCD display device 16 and a computer system comprising a CPU 11 electrically connected to the LCD display device 16 and a Bios Rom 17 consisting of a flash memory electrically connected to the CPU (col. 3, line 44 through col. 4, line 30).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electronic device of Minami by employing the computer system of Nakamura comprising a CPU electrically connected with the second display device and a flash memory electrically connected to the CPU in order to realize high-speed operation, power saving and low cost production (col. 1, lines 61-63).

Re claims 60 and 61, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2, in addition to the CPU 11 and the flash memory in the Bios Rom 17, Nakamura further discloses a VRAM 15, a DRAM 18, and a memory card 33 (col. 3, lines 44-65 and col. 4, lines 50-55), wherein the VRAM 15, the DRAM 18, and the memory card 33 are electrically connected with the CPU.

Re claim 68, Nakamura further discloses that the CPU processes and outputs an image signal, and a control circuit 14 (display controller) distributes the image signal as data to the LCD device 16 (col. 3, lines 51-60 and col. 4, lines 14-20). Accordingly, it is obvious that the image signal data corresponds to each pixel for image display in the LCD device.

Furthermore, Minami does not disclose that the thin film transistor of the second display device is formed of a semiconductor layer of amorphous silicon as recited in claims 52, 60, 69 and 78; or the first display device or the second display device includes an inverse stagger TFT as recited in claim 77.

However, according to an intended application, it is well known in the art that the TFT is formed of a semiconductor layer of amorphous silicon and the display device

includes a top gate TFT or an inverse stagger TFT as disclosed by Nakai (col. 17, lines 35-41).

Re claim 79, Nakamura discloses a flash memory electrically connected with the CPU as mentioned above.

Re claims 53, 62, 70 and 80, Minami discloses that the first display device 2 is an active matrix display (col. 3, lines 49-59).

Re claims 54, 63, 71 and 81, Priestman discloses that the touch screen can be used as a man machine interface combined with iconic and /or alphanumeric displays (col. 8, line 66 through col. 9, line 5). Accordingly, it is obvious that the second display device comprising the touch input tablet displays on a screen at least one item selected from the group consisting of at least one button and an image.

Re claims 55, 64, 72 and 82, Priestman discloses that the portable electronic device comprises audio portions 224, 228 as a communication function (col. 9, lines 18-30).

Re claims 56, 65, 73 and 83, Priestman discloses that the second display panel 220 comprises an image pickup device 222 (CCD video camera).

Re claims 57, 66, 74 and 84, Priestman discloses that one of the first display device and the second display device comprises a system 222 for identifying a user (col. 8, lines 54-64).

Re claims 59 and 76, Priestman discloses that the portable electronic device is a mobile telephone as shown in Fig. 4.

4. Claims 58, 67, 75 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami et al. (Minami, US 6,967,632) in view of Priestman et al. (Priestman, USPN 6,812,954 B1), Nakamura et al. (Nakamura, US 5,734,914) and Nakai et al. (Nakai, US 6,072,454) as applied to claims 51-57, 59-66, 68-74 and 76-84 above, and further in view of Watanabe (US 6,098,055).

As shown in Figs. 1 and 2, Nakamura discloses the CPU 11 including an image signal processing circuit 10A, wherein information processed by the CPU is outputted as the image signal from the image processing circuit 10A to the control circuit 14 (col. 3, lines 51-61 and col. 4, lines 14-20). However, Minami in view of Priestman, Nakamura and Nakai does not disclose a tablet interface for inputting a signal from the touch input tablet.

As shown in Figs. 2 and 6, Watanabe discloses a portable terminal comprising a liquid crystal display device 18 having a touch input tablet 19 (touch panel) and a tablet interface 24 (I/O interface) for inputting a signal from the touch input tablet (col. 4, lines 12-24 and col. 5, lines 47-59).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the electronic device of Minami by having a tablet interface for generating a signal from the touch input tablet of the second display device (col. 5, lines 47-59).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thoi V. Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-2292. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms, can be reached at (571) 272-1787.

Thoi V. Duong



06/13/2007